



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/665,633	09/19/2003	Huimin Kong	NEB-210-US	8942
28986	7590	03/08/2006	EXAMINER	
HARRIET M. STRIMPEL; NEW ENGLAND BIOLABS, INC. 240 COUNTY ROAD IPSWICH, MA 01938-2723			STRZELECKA, TERESA E	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1637	
DATE MAILED: 03/08/2006				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/665,633

Applicant(s)

KONG ET AL.

Examiner

Teresa E. Strzelecka

Art Unit

1637

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-50 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-50 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____. |

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
 - I. Claims 1-45, 49 and 50, drawn to a method for exponentially and selectively amplifying a target nucleic acid, the method comprising:
 - (a) providing single strand templates of the target nucleic acid to be amplified;
 - (b) adding oligonucleotide primers for hybridizing to the templates of step (a);
 - (c) synthesizing an extension product of the oligonucleotide primers which are complementary to the templates, by means of a DNA polymerase to form a duplex;
 - (d) contacting the duplex of step (c) with a helicase preparation for unwinding the duplex; and
 - (e) repeating steps (b)-(d) to exponentially and selectively amplify the target nucleic acid, classified in class 435, subclass 91.2.
 - II. Claims 46-48, drawn to a nucleic acid amplification kit comprising a helicase preparation, a DNA polymerase and instructions for performing helicase dependent amplification, classified in class 435, subclass 975.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

2. Inventions II and I are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product. See MPEP § 806.05(h). In the instant case the kit of Group II can be used in an entirely different process, such as in vitro translation or recombination reactions rather than in the method of Group I.

Searching the inventions of Groups I and II together would impose serious search burden. The inventions of Groups I and II have a separate status in the art as shown by their different classifications. Moreover, in the instant case, the search for the helicase and polymerase of Group II and the method of using a them are not coextensive, since the combination of a polymerase and helicase may be used in a variety of different assays, such as in vitro transcription-translation, for example. Therefore, prior art which teaches a combination of a helicase and a polymerase would not necessarily be applicable to the method of Group I. Moreover, even if the helicase + DNA polymerase product were known, the method of using the product may be novel and unobvious in view of the preamble or active steps.

3. Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

4. This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species:

- A) the helicase preparation comprises a single helicase (claim 13),
- B) the helicase preparation comprises a plurality of helicases (claim 14),
- C) the helicase preparation comprises a 3' to 5' helicase (claim 15),
- D) the helicase preparation comprises a 5' to 3' helicase (claim 16),
- E) the helicase preparation comprises a superfamily 1 helicase (claim 17),
- F) the helicase preparation comprises a superfamily 4 helicase (claim 18),
- G) the helicase preparation comprises a superfamily 2 helicase (claim 19, in part),
- H) the helicase preparation comprises a superfamily 3 helicase (claim 19, in part),
- I) the helicase preparation comprises a AAA+ helicase (claim 19, in part),
- J) the helicase preparation comprises a hexameric helicase (claim 20),

Art Unit: 1637

- K) the helicase preparation comprises a monomeric helicase (claim 21, in part),
- L) the helicase preparation comprises a dimeric helicase (claim 21, in part),
- M) the helicase preparation comprises a UvrD helicase (claim 22),
- N) the helicase preparation comprises a thermostable UvrD helicase (claim 22, 23),
- O) the helicase preparation comprises an E. coli UvrD helicase (claim 24, in part; 25, 35),
- P) the helicase preparation comprises a Tte-UvrD helicase (claim 24, in part; 26, 38, 39),
- Q) the helicase preparation comprises a T7 Gp4 helicase (claim 24, in part; 28, 37),
- R) the helicase preparation comprises a RecBCD helicase (claim 24, in part; 27, 36),
- S) the helicase preparation comprises a DnaB helicase (claim 24, in part),
- T) the helicase preparation comprises an MCM helicase (claim 24, in part),
- U) the helicase preparation comprises a Rep helicase (claim 24, in part),
- V) the helicase preparation comprises a RecQ helicase (claim 24, in part),
- W) the helicase preparation comprises a PcrA helicase (claim 24, in part),
- X) the helicase preparation comprises a SV40 large T antigen helicase (claim 24, in part),
- Y) the helicase preparation comprises a Herpes virus helicase (claim 24, in part),
- Z) the helicase preparation comprises a yeast Sgs1 helicase (claim 24, in part),
- AA) the helicase preparation comprises a DEAH_ATP-dependent helicases (claim 24, in part),

AB) the helicase preparation comprises a Papillomavirus helicase E1 (claim 24, in part).

The species are independent or distinct because they contain compositions of different types and numbers of helicases with differing structures, cofactors and properties.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, claim 1 is generic.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of an allowable generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

5. The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of MPEP § 821.04. **Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product** will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier. Amendments submitted after final rejection are governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, and 112. Until an elected

product claim is found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined. See "Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of *In re Ochiai*, *In re Brouwer* and 35 U.S.C. § 103(b)," 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution either to maintain dependency on the product claims or to otherwise include the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.** Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

6. Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

7. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Teresa E. Strzelecka whose telephone number is (571) 272-0789. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:30-5:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gary Benzion can be reached on (571) 272-0782. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

**TERESA STRZELECKA
PATENT EXAMINER**

Teresa Strzelecka
3/5/06